



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,913	08/01/2006	Hideji Tajima	10287.74	6906
27683	7590	10/05/2010		
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP			EXAMINER	
IP Section			LUDLOW, JAN M	
2323 Victory Avenue				
Suite 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dallas, TX 75219			1773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/552,913	TAJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jan M. Ludlow	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 4-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 4-7, 13-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingenhoven (6869571), and further in view of Tajima (WO01/53839). Note that US 6,691,748 is relied upon as an English language equivalent translation of WO01/53839.

Ingenhoven teaches a device for aspirating and dispensing having a large diameter portion 20; a small diameter portion at the bottom of adapter 8'; a sliding section comprising piston 19, rod 4, and a connection section shown as a knob at the top of rod 4; actuating part 13, non-actuating part comprising fitting 3', and suction and discharge mechanism 11, 12, 14. Sheath 8 is engaged with and covering all of the small diameter portion at the bottom of adapter 8'. See Figs 1-3, esp. 1 and 3. With respect to "detachable manner" in the parts are structurally capable of being disassembled, as by sliding large diameter sleeve 20 out of fitting 3' in Figure 3, or sliding the knob out of the containment notch in actuating part 13. The sliding section is between the knob (connector) and the bottom of the tip (small diameter).

5. Ingenhoven fails to teach a container placement area, movement section, magnetic section or temperature controller.
6. Tajima teaches a device similar to that of Ingenhoven. A container placement area 12 is provided with stations for temperature control and magnetic treatment as claimed (see, e.g., abstract). Tips can be attached as claimed in step S103.
7. It would have been obvious to provide a container placement area with stations for temperature control and magnetic treatment as claimed in the device of Ingenhoven in order to perform processes such as PCR as taught by Tajima. In that Ingenhoven teaches moving the array of cylinders over the liquid sources (col. 7, lines 65-67), it would have been obvious to provide means for moving the cylinders instead of or in addition to means for moving the containers. With respect to claim 4, a fitting section, e.g., element 10 of Ingenhoven connects the cylinders to the suction and discharge

mechanism, and it would have been obvious to make it detachable, e.g., in order to facilitate cleaning or replacement of parts. Recess 18 constitutes the instant gap elimination mechanism of instant claim 5 as a tight fit is shown. An O-ring can be provided between the small diameter section and sheath (col. 3, line 40) constituting the protruding engagement section of instant claim 6.

8. Claims 8-10, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingenhoven and Tajima as applied to claims above, and further in view of Gordon (2003/0026732)

9. The primary references fail to teach an optical system for detecting fluid level in the cylinders.

Gordon teaches a pipette system similar to that of Ingenhoven. Optical detectors 11110, 1112 are provided to detect liquid levels in the pipette cylinders to ensure accurate operation (Figure 11, abstract).

It would have been obvious to provide optical level sensors in the device of Ingenhoven in order to ensure accuracy as taught by Gordon. With respect to claim 9, it would have been obvious to use reflection using a mirror in place of transmission as was known in the art and to use a CCD as a known light detector. With respect to claim 10, it would have been obvious to make the detectors moveable, e.g., in order to facilitate desired positioning, replacement or removal.

10. Claims 11-12, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingenhoven and Tajima as applied to claims above, and further in view of Chow (5275951).

11. The primary references fail to teach a barcode on the containers.
12. Chow teaches a barcode on a multiwell plate for identifying the plate and storing information (col. 7, lines 60-68).
13. It would have been obvious to provide a barcode on the containers of Ingenhoven and Tajima in order to identify the plates for data collection as taught by Chow. It would have been obvious to make the barcode removable, e.g., in order to reuse the plates in order to reduce waste as was known in the art.
14. Claims 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
15. Applicant's arguments filed July 21, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
16. Applicant argues that Ingenhoven does not teach an actuating part of the suction and discharge mechanism detachable, but just as in the instant invention Ingenhoven shows protruding knobs fitted into a slot in the "actuating portion" of the piston drive. The examiner notes that applicant has not correlated that parts of the instant invention to the claim language and described how the instant parts define over the parts of Ingenhoven. The inventions are substantially the same—there is a pipette with larger body and a smaller discharge end, a piston in the pipette with a knob on the top, and the knob fits into a slot in a plate that moves up and down. With respect to "detachable manner" in the parts are structurally capable of being disassembled, as by sliding large

diameter sleeve 20 out of fitting 3' in Figure 3, or sliding the knob out of the containment notch in actuating part 13.

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-24 are persuasive.
18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jan M. Ludlow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797

/Jan M. Ludlow/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797